# **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The outstanding Office Action rejects all pending Claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 19. There is some confusion as to Claims 13, 14, 17, & 18.

Claims 11 & 12 were subject to prior restriction requirement and were withdrawn from consideration. Claims 3, 4, 10, 15, 16, & 20 were also cancelled previously.

Claims 1, 2, & 4-9 are <u>cancelled herein</u>. Claims 13, 14, 17, & 18 are <u>amended</u> and <u>remain pending</u> in this application. The various grounds of rejections are discussed below.

#### Objections and Rejections related to 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 13, 14, 17, & 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, "as being indefinite ..." as including a number of errors of a typographic nature. Accordingly, the applicants have made typographic adjustments to Claim 13. The subject matter and scope of Claim 13 has not been changed. It is believed that these amendments should correct the deficiencies noted by the Examiner.

Additionally, the applicants have noted that Claims 14, 17, & 18 include a misspelling of the word "reticle". This has been corrected in the amendments to Claims 14, 17, & 18.

## Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-6, 10, 13, 15-17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by the *Bleeker* reference.

The Applicants respectfully point out that Claims 3, 4, 10, 15, 16, and 20 were previously cancelled (in the prior Amendment A) making this rejection moot as to those claims.

Claims 1, 5, and 6, are cancelled herein making discussion of these claims moot.

The Action also lists Claims 13 and 17 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by the *Bleeker* reference. The applicants believe this may have been an error. The applicants respectfully point out that the rejections of both of these claims are specifically listed as allowable and the rejections of these claims are specifically withdrawn (See, the Action at page 6: headings 8 and 9 respectively). Given that the *Bleeker* reference is not applicable to these claims and does not anticipate Claims 13 and 17, the applicants respectfully request that the

pending rejections and objections to Claims 13 and 17 be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed to issue.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U. S. C. §§ 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bleeker* in view of *Sandstrom*.

Applicants have cancelled Claims 2 and 8 making this ground of rejection moot.

Claims 7, 9, and 19 also stand rejected under 35 U. S. C. §§ 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bleeker* in view of *Cassarly*.

Applicants have cancelled Claims 7, 9, and 19 also making this ground of rejection moot.

### **Allowable Subject Matter:**

The Actions defines Claims 13, 14, 17, and 18 as allowable if the 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph issues are addressed. As discussed above, it is believed that these issues are dealt with by the amendments made herein.

#### Conclusion:

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention as presently presented is patentable over the art of record and that this case is now in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, the applicants request withdrawal of all pending rejections and request reconsideration of the pending application and prompt passage to issuance. As an aside, the applicants clarify that any lack of response to any of the issues raised by the Examiner is not an admission by the applicant as to the accuracy of the Examiner's assertions with respect to such issues. Accordingly, applicant's specifically reserve the right to respond to such issues at a later time during the prosecution of the present application, should such a need arise.

As always, the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the applicants representative to discuss any matters pertaining to this case. Should the Examiner wish to contact the undersigned for any reason, the telephone numbers set out below can be used.

Additionally, if any fees are due in connection with the filing of this Amendment, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct such fees from the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 12-2252 (Order No. 03-1810).

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER LLP

Francis T. Kalinski II Registration No. 44,177

P.O. Box 70250 Oakland, CA 94612-0250 (408) 255-8001